## 2 3 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 4 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 5 6 7 8 TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED LLC No. C 14-3640 CW and MCM PORTFOLIO LLC, 10 ORDER ON Plaintiffs, DEFENDANTS' MOTION 11 FOR CLARIFICATION v. 12 (Docket No. 297) CANON, INC. et al., 13 Defendants. 14 15 TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED No. C 14-3641 CW 16 LLC, (Docket No. 72) 17 Plaintiff, 18 v. 19 FALCON COMPUTER SYSTEMS, INC., 20 Defendant. 21 22 TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED LLC No. C 14-3643 CW and MCM PORTFOLIO LLC, 23 (Docket No. 83) Plaintiffs, 24 v. 25 HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY, 26 Defendant. 27 28

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

```
TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED
                                                   No. C 14-3645 CW
 1
   LLC,
                                                   (Docket No. 69)
 2
              Plaintiff,
 3
         v.
4
   NEWEGG INC. et al.,
5
              Defendants.
 6
   TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED
                                                   No. C 14-3646 CW
   LLC,
8
                                                   (Docket No. 79)
              Plaintiff,
9
        v.
10
   SEIKO EPSON CORPORATION, et al.,
11
              Defendants.
12
13
                                                  No. C 14-3647 CW
   TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED LLC
   and MCM PORTFOLIO LLC,
                                                   (Docket No. 75)
15
              Plaintiffs,
16
         v.
   SHUTTLE, INC., et al.,
18
              Defendants.
19
20
```

The matter comes before the Court on Defendants' administrative motion for clarification of the Court's April 10, 2015 order appointing Kwan Chan as Technical Advisor in the above-captioned cases. Docket No. 297. In the order, the Court stated that each party shall bear the cost of the Technical Advisor on a

 $<sup>^{\</sup>mbox{\scriptsize 1}}$  Docket Numbers correspond to the docket for case number 14-3640.

per capita basis. As Defendants point out, this contradicts the
Court's earlier statement regarding the payment of the Technical
Advisor, made at the November 19, 2014 case management conference
when the Court indicated that it would order the parties to pay
the Technical Advisor on a 50/50 split, with Plaintiffs paying
half and Defendants paying half. Moreover, as Defendants show, a
50/50 split is equitable in these cases because the parties will
ordinarily file two sets of briefs, one from Plaintiffs and one
from Defendants.

Defendants' motion is GRANTED and the April 10, 2015 order appointing Mr. Chan is amended as follows: Plaintiffs and Defendants shall split the cost of the Technical Advisor 50/50. Plaintiffs and Defendants shall each divide their half among them on a per capita basis.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 04/29/2015

CLAUDIA WILKEN
United States District Judge

Janaiale H